

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,275	03/22/2004	Nobuo Setoguchi	64766-012	8968
	7590 01/12/200 `WILL & EMERY LI		EXAMINER	
600 13TH STR			NGUYEN, HUY THAN	UY THANH
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
• ,			2621	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
. 3 MONTHS		01/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	V			
Office Action Summary		10/805,275	SETOGUCHI ET AL.	71			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		HUY T. NGUYEN	2621				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for	or Reply						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commu D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status				•			
1)  🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 O</u>	ctober 2006					
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	,—						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 12-129 is/are pending in the application	on.	•				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
	Claim(s) <u>12-29,39-97,103-117,119-121</u> and 12			•			
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7)🖂	Claim(s) 31-38 and 122 is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicat	on Papers						
9)[7]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.				
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f)				
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, (4) 5. (.).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		•			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stag	је			
	application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
	•						
Attachmen	• •						
1) U Notic 2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F					
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/01/06,12/14/06.</u> .	6)					

Art Unit: 2621

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 30 and 98-102,118 and 128-129 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 47 and 20 –25 of copending Application No. 11/090034. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 30 and 98-102,118 and 128-129 of the present application recites an method that corresponds to the apparatus of claims 47 and 20-25 of copending Application No. 11/090034. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of claims 20 –25 of

Art Unit: 2621

copending Application No. 11/090034 to perform the method of claims 47, 98-102,118 and 128-129 of the present application

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 31-38 and 122 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. Claims 12-29, 39-97, 103-117, 119-121 and 123-127 and allowed.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUY T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7378. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM -6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

H.N

HUY NGUYEN PRIMAZIJAKAMINER